

Remarks

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 13, and 26-27 have been amended to clarify that the context resources used to service the data access task are pre-emptible, between the first response and a first subsidiary request, for use to support other data access tasks. Claims 1, 13, and 26-27 have also been amended to clarify that the context resources used to service the data access task are pre-emptible, between a subsidiary response and a subsequent subsidiary request, for use to support other data access tasks.

As amended, claims 1-27 are corrected as required by the Examiner. Claims 1-27, as amended, are believed to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11, 13-23, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha (US Pub. No. 2004/0117375) in view of Boyd (US Pub. No. 2004/0049580).

Saha describes direct memory access for performing database operations between two or more machines. The Examiner directs particular attention to Figure 5 and paragraph 60, which describes a series of data transfers and acknowledgments. In Saha, each data transfer is followed by an acknowledgment when all of the data held in the buffer is used. Upon receiving the acknowledgment, the client can then place more data into the buffer.

The Examiner acknowledges that Saha does not disclose a data access task. The Examiner relies on Boyd as a secondary reference. Boyd does describe work queue entries. However, the work queue entries in Boyd do not involve subsidiary requests and responses as claimed. That is, Boyd discloses a work queue entry, but does not disclose a data access task as

claimed. The claimed data access task is partially completed by the first response and further completed by each subsidiary response. There is no such teaching in Boyd.

Further, there is no teaching of the claimed subject matter including the context resources used to service the data access task are pre-emptible, between the first response and a first subsidiary request, for use to support other data access tasks; and the context resources used to service the data access task are pre-emptible, between a subsidiary response and a subsequent subsidiary request, for use to support other data access tasks.

For teaching pre-emption, the Examiner only relies on Saha. The portions of Saha referred to by the Examiner do not describe such pre-emption, but only describe data buffering and a series of separate data transfers and acknowledgments. That is, there is no pre-emption of context resources, the client only places more data into a buffer when the buffer is empty without the occurrence of any pre-emption.

Put another way, the claimed invention relates to using a series of subsidiary requests and subsidiary responses to complete a data access task. Saha only describes separate transfers as opposed to a data access task within which context resources are pre-emptible as claimed. As for Boyd, there is no pre-emption during processing of a work queue entry.

In response to Applicant's previous arguments, the Examiner again refers to paragraph 60, and states that memory resources associated with the complete data chunk transferred are pre-empted. Saha is only describing separate transfers. There is no teaching of pre-emptible context resources in the context of using a series of subsidiary requests and subsidiary responses to complete a data access task. To the extent that Saha describes a series of transfers in paragraph 60, these are separate transfers as opposed to a single data access task within which context resources are pre-emptible as claimed. Further, note that the work queue entry in Boyd, to the extent that this is a data access task, context resources are not pre-emptible during processing of a work queue entry.

The pre-emption feature is recited in each independent claim. Accordingly, claims 1-11, 13-23, and 25-27 are believed to be patentable.

Claims 12 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha in view of Boyd, further in view of Turner (An Approach For Congestion Control In Infiniband).

Claims 12 and 24 are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

Pazhani Pillai et al.

By /Jeremy J. Curcuri/
Jeremy J. Curcuri
Reg. No. 42,454
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 11/30/2009

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351